

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-A205*	The Influence of Flood Regimes, Vegetative and Geomorphic Structures on the Links between Aquatic & Terrestrial Systems	Center for Integrated Watershed Science & Management	VG			MH		High	The Panel concurs with Geographic Panel 3 and TARP conclusions. This is a critically important area of research for CALFED, even though the hypotheses and conceptual models could be better developed, and the links between elements better defined.	\$2,521,236
2001-A207*	Real-Time Flow Monitoring	DWR	E		H	MH		High	The Panel concurs with very positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. CALFED contracting requirements constrain funding to no more than 3 years. AFRP funding is for one year. The Panel recommends full funding for the allowable period, depending on the source. This proposal, while valuable, may be largely characterized as baseline monitoring, and appropriate for the future CALFED baseline monitoring program.	\$418,700
2001-B201*	Tuolumne River Restoration: Special Run Pool 10	Turlock Irrigation District	F				MH	High	The project could result in important information for future projects involving restoration of mining pools in river channels. However, the proposal lacks detail in key areas, especially monitoring and data dissemination, limiting its potential usefulness. The Panel recommends only funding the permitting, planning and easement-related activities at this time as suggested by Geographic Panel 4. The Panel also recommends coordination with the AFRP Adaptive Management Forum for Large Scale Restoration Projects.	\$543,530
2001-B202	Arundo Donax: Survey and Eradication	CSU Chico	F		H			High	The Panel concurs with favorable conclusions by Geographic Review Panel 2. The Panel recommends funding the mapping component, and implementing and monitoring eradication and riparian restoration components at one or two sites as a demonstration project.	\$360,000
2001-B203*	Invasive Spartina Project (ISP)	California Coastal Conservancy	G	M				High	The Panel concurs with the TARP and Geographic reviews that the proponents failed to articulate the need for database and website. The Panel recommends funding those parts considered E, VG, G and F by Geographic Panel 1. Do not fund database development or website.	\$1,793,661

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-C200*	Revised Phase 2 - Merced River Salmon Habitat Enhancement: River Mile 42 to 44 (Robinson Ranch Site)	DFG	P				MH	High	The Panel disagrees with TARP, due to the project's importance for CALFED's ERP, agreeing with the Geographic Panel review. However, the Panel recommends thorough review by the State Reclamation Board during the planning process. The Panel also recommends coordination with the AFRP Adaptive Management Forum for Large Scale Restoration Projects.	\$1,699,101
2001-C205*	San Joaquin River NWR Riparian Habitat Protection & Floodplain Restoration Project - Phase II	USFWS	G				M	High	Panel concurs with TARP and recommends the following conditions: 1) completion of flood management evaluation and resolution of issues; 2) creation and integration of a technical oversight committee; and 3) incorporation of information developed by D202. This project is consistent with the concepts being developed by the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.	\$7,646,233
2001-C209*	Tolumne River Mining Reach Restoration No 3, Warner-Deardorff Segment	Turlock Irrigation District	VG/E				MH	High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic panel on the importance of the Mining Reach Restoration Project but shares the concern of the Geographic Panel that the full funding of this project should be contingent upon (1) successful implementation of previously funded segments, and (2) that the entire project receive outside multi-disciplinary input and review for example, through the AFRP Adaptive Management Forum for Large Scale Restoration Projects. At this time, the Panel recommends funding only project design, right-of-way engineering, and pre-project monitoring.	\$518,670
2001-D200	Cosumnes/Mokelumne Corridor Floodplain Acquisitions, Management, and Restoration Planning	The Nature Conservancy	VG			H		High	Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic panel reviews. This is a multi-purpose project that provides ecosystem benefits and flood damage reduction.	\$3,044,342

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-D201	Habitat Acquisition for Riparian Brush Rabbit and Riparian Woodrat	USFWS	VG				MH	High	Panel concurs with favorable reviews and supports full funding with the condition that the proposed land acquisition be disclosed to and coordinated with San Joaquin River Management Program and the San Joaquin River Flood Management Association. This project is consistent with the concepts being developed by the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.	\$2,720,085
2001-D202*	Non-Structural Alternative at the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge: Refinement for Habitat Enhancement	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	F				MH	High	The Panel supports the Geographic Panel's ranking of medium high. This is potentially a very important modeling exercise that has application to other restoration efforts in the region. Project must be coordinated with C205. This project is consistent with the concepts being developed by the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.	\$231,942
2001-D203*	Yolo Bypass Management Strategy, Phase II	Yolo Basin Foundation	F/G			MH		High	The Panel concurs with the favorable Geographic Panel review and its recommendation to fund only Task 1 to continue working group meetings and Task 2 to evaluate potential economic impacts of changes in land use.	\$210,000
2001-E200*	Phase II: Demonstration Project for the Protection and Enhancement of Delta In-Channel Islands (Construction & Monitoring)	Association of Bay Area Governments for the S.F. Estuary Project	VG	MH				High	The Panel concurs with the TARP who gave the proposal a very good rating and with Geographic Panel 1 who gave this proposal a medium-high rating. The Panel recommends funding for the full allowable term. CALFED contracting requirements constrain funding to no more than 3 years.	\$928,150
2001-E201*	Hill Slough West Habitat Restoration Demonstration Project, Phase II	DFG	G	MH				High	The Panel concurs with the findings of the Geographic Panel which identified this as a valuable demonstration project to evaluate restoration methods for other sites in Suisun Bay. The proposal was rated relatively high by the technical reviews and Geographic panel.	\$87,000
2001-E204*	Butte Creek/Sanborn Slough Bifurcation Upgrade Project	California Waterfowl Association	G		H			High	The Panel concurs with Geographic Panel rating of high. Proposal is subsequent phase of project previously funded by CALFED, CVPIA and others. Will benefit both spring-run chinook and wetland habitats in the Butte Basin.	\$1,000,000

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-E205	Suisun Marsh Property Acquisition & Habitat Restoration	DWR	VG	MH				High	The Panel concurs with the findings of the TARP and Geographic Panel that the described acquisition of land in Suisun Marsh for tidal marsh restoration is a high priority, and that despite some concerns about the lack of details regarding the conceptual model, physical modeling and monitoring, the project should be funded. Detailed comments provided by the technical reviewer should be considered as the project progresses.	\$536,750
2001-E211	Feasibility Study of the Ecosystem & Water Quality Benefits Associated with Restoration of Franks Tract, Big Break, and Lower Sherman Lake	DWR	VG	H				High	The Panel concurs with very favorable reviews of Geographic Panel and TARP. This is an ambitious, large study with potential multiple system-wide benefits.	\$1,218,105
2001-E212*	Ecological Monitoring of Tolay & Cullinan Ranch Tidal Wetlands Restoration	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	VG	MH				High	The Panel concurs with favorable reviews by TARP and Geographic panels. The project adds post-construction monitoring program to previously funded project.	\$593,931
2001-F200*	Transport, Transformation & Effects of Se and C in the Delta: Implications for ERP	USGS	G	M				High	The Panel believes the proposal was well written overall, and expects this research group will demonstrate a high level of scientific productivity in an important research area. However, Panel is concerned that all reviewers with hydrodynamic modeling expertise (several independent reviewers and the TARP) believe the proposal modeling approach to be unnecessarily elaborate and expensive for the questions asked. We therefore recommend funding for the modeling tasks (Tasks 1 and 2) be reduced by one-half, reducing the total project cost from \$3.36 million to \$2.6 million. In addition, clarification is required for Task 6 as there is no individual identified with responsibility for this task and there are no funds allocated for this task in the budget.	\$2,600,000

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-F202	Large-Scale Pilot Demonstration of Passivation Technology For Restoration of Newton Copper Mine	University of Nevada	VG			ML		High	The proposed technology, if successful, would have considerable system-wide benefits. The Panel concurs with the TARP, however, that additional laboratory demonstration is needed before field implementation. In addition, the proposed field work raises questions regarding CALFED funding of remediation at a site already under clean-up order. We therefore recommend funding at a level of \$60,000 to support the laboratory component but not the proposed field work.	\$60,000
2001-F212	Rainbow Trout Toxicity Monitoring: An Evaluation of the Role of Contaminants on Anadromous Salmonids	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	VG	ML	MH	H		High	The Panel concurs with the majority of reviewers, and recommends that the list of sampling locations be revised to better reflect anadromous fish distribution and spawning areas.	\$530,000
2001-G202	Staten Island Acquisition	The Nature Conservancy	VG	MH				High	The Panel recognizes this project as a major step to complete the East Delta Habitat Corridor of ERP. Timeline for action important. TARP and Geographic Panels were concerned with the magnitude of cost, as was the Panel, otherwise all favored proposal.	\$35,110,873
2001-G203	Battle Creek Riparian Protection	The Nature Conservancy	VG		H			High	The Panel concurs with Geographic Panel on importance of project and with TARP on the need for detailed land-use monitoring plan that addresses compatible agricultural uses.	\$1,000,000
2001-G207	Sustaining Agriculture and Wildlife Beyond the Riparian Corridor	Yolo County Resource Conservation District	VG			MH		High	Concur with TARP and Geographic Panel comments. This proposal is well developed and utilizes a highly qualified team of specialists. The approach has high applicability throughout the CALFED region and the inclusion of landowners will help make this project successful. While similar to H211, this project complements that proposal by focusing on irrigated agricultural lands, while H211 focuses on rangelands.	\$1,464,167
2001-H200*	Lassen National Forest Watershed Stewardship Within the Anadromous Watersheds of Butte, Deer, and Mill Creeks	USFS	G		H			High	Concur with TARP, Geographic Panel, and individual reviewer ratings. Project will accomplish important sediment reductions in spring-run chinook watersheds.	\$849,845
2001-H202	Tuolumne River Watershed Outreach and Stewardship	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust	F				MH	High	Panel concurs with Geographic Panel 4. This funds the reprinting of a very successful map and brochure.	\$62,000

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-H203*	Sonoma Creek Watershed Conservancy, 2001-2003	Southern Sonoma County Resource Conservation District	G	M				High	Panel concurs with TARP. This is a comprehensive program with good team and good cost-share. The Panel feels that the high feasibility and collaboration outweighs the monitoring weaknesses. However, monitoring actions could be better described.	\$545,170
2001-H207*	Sacramento River Conservation Area Program	CSU Chico	G		H			High	The Panel concurs with the high rating of Geographic Panel, contingent on budget review.	\$326,991
2001-H208	Kirker Creek Watershed CRMP Program	Contra Costa Resource Conservation District	VG	H				High	The Panel concurs with the high ratings by technical reviewers, TARP and the Geographic Panel.	\$198,450
2001-H211*	Willow Slough Watershed Rangeland Stewardship Program	National Audubon Society-CA	VG			MH		High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel that this is a very ambitious but sound project that could be a model for application in other watersheds. While similar to G207, this project complements that proposal by focusing on rangelands, while G207 focuses on irrigated agricultural lands.	\$1,800,668
2001-H212	Watershed Stewardship in Marsh Creek: A Project to Protect Water Quality in the Western Delta	The Natural Heritage Institute	G	MH				High	While finding this restoration effort to be promising, the Panel concurs with the TARP that the results of Task 1 could substantially alter the need for or scope of the other tasks, and therefore recommend funding only for Task 1 at this time.	\$126,000
2001-I201*	Watershed Education, Headwaters to the Ocean	Sacramento River Discovery Center	VG		H	M		High	The Panel agrees with TARP and Geographic Panel 4 that CALFED should support the continuation of this successful hands-on education project. The Panel agrees that Task 5 video development should not be funded and that proponent should re-consider implementation of Task 4 by using existing aerial photos or work with local agencies to reduce cost.	\$321,816
2001-I202*	Estuary Action Challenge Environmental Education Project	Earth Island Institute	VG	MH				High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels. Continuation of a highly successful school district program. The proponent must coordinate with local DFG on frog rearing and riparian plantings.	\$50,000

Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-I205*	Traveling Film Festival/San Joaquin River Oral History Film	Independent Film Group	E	MH	H	M	M	High	The Panel concurs with generally positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. We concur with Geographic Panel 4 that proponents must ensure coordination with San Joaquin Valley-based groups.	\$216,550
2001-I207	Environmental Stewardship Educational Conferences and Tours	Committee for Sustainable Agriculture	VG	ML			MH	High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels. Recommend funding San Joaquin Valley conferences and tours only. Applicant should expand target audience to include affected government planning staff, and include introduced species and their impacts in the presentations.	\$48,500
2001-I208	Delta Studies Program: San Joaquin County Schools	San Joaquin County Office of Education	E	H				High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel 1 who rated the proposal excellent and high.	\$306,291
2001-I209	Adopt-A-Watershed Leadership Institute	Adopt-A-Watershed	E	MH	H	M		High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic panels. Panel concurs that this is a very solid, well thought-out proposal warranting full funding.	\$592,884
2001-I210*	Discover the Flyway II	Yolo Basin Foundation	VG			MH		High	The Panel concurs with the previous panels comments. The project can have large system-wide benefits	\$197,987
2001-I211	Bay-Delta Learning Initiative	Water Education Foundation	VG	MH	H	M		High	The Panel concurs with previous reviews that implementation of the project has broad system-wide benefits. All regions identified the project as highly relevant to their area. WEF has an excellent educational record, cost share is significant. Fills educational gaps for journalists and the general public. Targets non-native invasive species education for boaters and anglers.	\$126,668
2001-I213*	Educating Farmers and Landowners in Biological Resource Management	Community Alliance with Family Farmers	E			MH	MH	High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel that this project is an extension of a valuable ongoing effort to educate farmers and landowners about reducing toxic input and promoting habitat restoration.	\$1,066,593

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-J201*	Biological Assessment of Green sturgeon in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Watershed	UC Davis	E	H	H	H		High	The Panel concurs with findings of reviewers that information on this species is needed; this is a well-designed investigation that is highly recommended by all reviews.	\$641,362
2001-K204*	Using Molecular Techniques to Preserve Genetic Integrity of Endangered Salmon in a Supplementation Program	UC Davis	E		H			High	The Panel concurs with the Excellent TARP and High Geographic Panel ratings.	\$400,000
2001-K206*	San Joaquin River Chinook Salmon Age Determinations: Phase II	DFG	VG				H	High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic Panel ratings.	\$54,555
2001-K209	Estimating the Abundance of Sacramento River Juvenile Winter Chinook Salmon with Comparisons to Adult Escapement	USFWS	E		H			High	The Panel concurs with uniformly favorable review of all panels. Critical monitoring of winter-run chinook is combined with a strong experimental design.	\$1,081,638
2001-K210	Health Monitoring of Hatchery and Natural Fall-run Chinook Juveniles	USFWS	VG				H	High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. Add condition that reports including data and conclusions from the study must be provided to CALFED.	\$40,890
2001-K212*	Evaluate Use of a Two-Dimensional Hydraulic and Habitat Simulation Model to Assess Benefits of Channel Restoration	USFWS	VG				MH	High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic Panel ratings.	\$11,000

Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-K213*	Battle Creek Anadromous Salmonid Monitoring Projects	USFWS	G		H			High	As stated by Geographic Panel, the Panel agrees that there is a critical need to collect juvenile production data for the overall Battle Creek Projects. However, the Panel also concurs with TARP conclusions that data collection could be more clearly tied to hypothesis and objectives. The budget should be reviewed during contract negotiations to see if cost savings will accrue if other proposals from the Red Bluff Office of the USFWS are approved. This proposal, while valuable, may be largely characterized as baseline monitoring, and appropriate for the future CALFED baseline monitoring program. However, the Panel supports funding for three years with the expectation that it will be some time before the baseline monitoring program is able to support such projects.	\$1,576,152
2001-K214*	Sacramento River Winter Chinook Salmon Carcass Survey	USFWS	G		H			High	The Panel concurs with positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. Proponent is encouraged to submit a proposal for verifying age-size relationships through scale analysis. The budget should be reviewed during contract negotiations to see if cost savings will accrue if other proposals from the Red Bluff Office of the USFWS are approved. This proposal, while valuable, may be largely characterized as baseline monitoring, and appropriate for the future CALFED baseline monitoring program. However, the Panel supports funding for three years with the expectation that it will be some time before the baseline monitoring program is able to support such projects.	\$305,273
2001-K215*	Clear Creek Juvenile Salmonid Monitoring Project	USFWS	VG		H			High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. This proposal, while valuable, may be largely characterized as baseline monitoring, and appropriate for the future CALFED baseline monitoring program. However, the Panel supports funding for three years with the expectation that it will be some time before the baseline monitoring program is able to support such projects.	\$871,026

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-K218*	Butte Creek, Big Chico Creek, and Sutter Bypass Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Evaluation	DFG	G		MH	H		High	The Panel concurs with the favorable TARP and Geographic Panel review. The Panel agrees with the Staff Review that the proposal covers too many elements and could have been improved by better separation of the individual components. The conceptual model is weak and several models would have been better. The TARP recommended partial funding and the Panel agrees. The project proponent declared that Tasks 1, 2 and 3 are inseparable components. The Panel recommends funding of Tasks 1, 2 and 3.	\$280,951
2001-K219	Lower Calaveras River Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Life History Limiting Factors Assessment	Fishery Foundation of California	G			H		High	The Panel concurs with positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings.	\$314,704
2001-K221	Food Resources for Zooplankton in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta	UC Davis	VG	MH				High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. Applicant needs to demonstrate appropriate project management capabilities given the loss of a post-doctoral researcher who was central to the project.	\$576,422
2001-L203*	White Mallard Dam and Associated Diversions	California Waterfowl Association	G		H			High	The Panel concurs with positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings.	\$84,938
2001-L204*	Fish Treadmill-Developed Fish Screen Criteria for Native Sacramento-San Joaquin Watershed Fishes	UC Davis	VG	MH	H	M	M	High	There was agreement among all reviewers and this Panel that data generated by this project is of high priority for fish screen design, but there was also uniform agreement that the cost of this project is excessive. We note that the labor hours requested equates to 17 people working with the fish treadmill full-time for the life of the project. The TARP felt the experimental design was too elaborate, the debris testing excessive, the physiological stress indicators unnecessary and the number of experimental variables excessive. We also suggest that the proposed debris testing could be done on only a subset of the species. The budget is not structured in such a way so as to allow us to estimate the cost saving by deletion of particular experiments, but if the above recommendations are accepted we suggest a 40% reduction in project cost.	\$1,362,878

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-L205*	Lower Butte Creek Project: Phase III Facilitation/Coordination and Construction of Three Fish Passage Modifications to Sutter Bypass West Side Water Control Structures	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	VG			MH		High	The Panel concurs with favorable TARP and Geographic panel ratings. Panel suggests that overhead be re-evaluated during contract negotiation.	\$4,783,719
2001-L206*	RD 2035 Fish Screen Design and Environmental Review	Reclamation District 2035	VG		H			High	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel summary comments that this screening project is a high priority. Need to review cost per cfs for similar projects as suggested by TARP. Cost share by applicant is encouraged.	\$1,820,000
2001-L207	Patterson Irrigation District Positive Barrier Fish Screen on San Joaquin River Diversion	Patterson Irrigation District	VG				H	High	The Panel concurs with positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings.	\$175,000
2001-L210*	Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam - Balance of Phase II Funding with Requested Change of Scope	Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority	G		H			High	The Panel concurs with the favorable TARP and Geographic Panel comments.	\$1,574,000
2001-L212	Stockton East Water District and Calaveras County Water District Fish Screen Facilities - Calaveras River	Stockton East Water District and Calaveras County Water District	VG			H		High	The Panel concurs with positive TARP and Geographic Panel ratings. Applicant must add a Phase V for monitoring facility operations with no increase in funding award.	\$670,000
2001-L213*	American Basin Fish Screen & Habitat Improvement Project	Natomas Mutual Water Company	E		H			High	The Panel concurs with the TARP and Geographic Panel 4 which rated this proposal excellent and high.	\$950,000
TOTAL High								60		\$91,247,397

October 2, 2000				2001 Proposal Information				Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-A206	Narrows 2 Hydro Power Plant Flow Bypass System Design	Yuba County Water Agency	F			M		Medium	The Panel concurs with TARP review concerns about the lack of detail for justification of design. However, the information gathered by this project will be valuable for solving problems related to flow fluctuations. The benefit of this information outweighs the potential for a stranded investment. This is an important issue on an important stream for species of concern. Note that correction to budget calculations reduces funding from the requested amount of \$300,000 to \$200,000.	\$200,000
2001-C204*	Sedimentation in the Delta and Suisun Bay	USGS	G/VG	MH	L	M	ML	Medium	Panel recommends funding with the condition that costs and especially overhead are examined. The Panel agrees with the TARP that a synoptic study of this type is potentially valuable, and with the Staff review that stated the proposal would yield basic data to improve our understanding of the flux of sediments into and through the Delta. The Panel also shares the TARP concern that the information generated by the study may have limited use in planning restoration projects. Overhead rate (nearly 90%) should be reduced.	\$1,367,684
2001-C207	Spawning Habitat & Floodplain Restoration in the Stanislaus River, Phase I	Carl Mesick Consultants and Trust for Public Land	F/VG				MH	Medium	The Panel concurs with the reservations of the TARP and comments of the Geographic Panel. The Panel recommends funding completion of the Two-mile Bar portion of the project, removing the replication for gravel-size evaluations. Proponents should be required to coordinate with or establish an outside review team to obtain additional technical input. One possible forum for this is the AFRP Adaptive Management Forum for Large-Scale Channel Restoration Projects.	\$672,610
2001-C208	Tuolumne River Fine Sediment Management	Turlock Irrigation District	G				M	Medium	Panel concurs with medium rating by Geographic Panel as well as TARP and Geographic Panel reservations about the scientific/experimental aspects of the proposal and concerns about the short-term benefits of the sediment basin element.	\$910,486

Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-E203	Fay Island Restoration Project, Phase I	DFG	F/E	MH				Medium	The Panel concurs with TARP that this acquisition is excellent. This type of habitat is needed in Old River and ongoing work on Rhode Island will provide insight and connectivity to this project. TARP ranked feasibility study fair as they felt the information on later phases was inadequate, but the staff review concluded that for Phase I, the information and details provided are appropriate. Geographic Panel felt the project was a good opportunity and contributes to Stage I ERP goals. Location of project not identified as a high priority area for ERP, resulting in a medium priority ranking.	\$744,148
2001-H205*	Battle Creek Watershed Stewardship, Phase II	Battle Creek Watershed Conservancy	F		MH			Medium	The Panel concurs with the Geographic Panel recommendation. The proposal addresses a high priority area, but was not well written and did not fully respond to the PSP. The Conservancy must address TARP concerns about integration of a local data base, KRIS, into a Valley-wide database system.	\$268,817
2001-H209	Digital Soil Survey Mapping and Digital Orthophotoquad Imagery Development	Natural Resources Conservation Service	VG	MH	H	L	M	Medium	The Panel concurs with TARP and Staff reviews that it is appropriate to fund work only in high priority areas at this time, (i.e., Glenn County, Madera Area, Merced Area, East Stanislaus Area, and Tehama County). The soils information will be much more useful and accessible in electronic format. This conversion will also enable NRCS to develop soil attribute tables which correlate information on habitats, processes and species which would have system-wide benefits for restoration planning.	\$502,100
2001-I204*	Watershed Education Project	Chico Unified School District	F		H			Medium	The Panel concurs with the Geographic Panel 2 rating that this is a popular program. However, the Panel recognizes the concerns described by the TARP.	\$100,865
2001-J200	Genetic Identification of Watershed-Dependent Species of Special Concern in the Central Valley	CSU San Francisco	VG	MH	M	M	M	Medium	The Panel is aware of the concerns of prior reviewers as to management use of the data this study would generate, but believes the underlying scientific approach is of very high quality and has the potential to strengthen the scientific basis for resource management decisions.	\$851,669

October 2, 2000				2001 Proposal Information				Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-K203	Merced River Water Temperature Management Feasibility Study	Merced Irrigation District	F				MH	Medium	The Panel agrees with TARP which rated it fair and recommended partial funding. The Geographic Review Panel ranked it medium high and recommended funding only Task 1 and the related elements of Tasks 4 and 5 (in-kind cost share).	\$45,000
2001-K217	Juvenile Salmon Migratory Behavior Study in North, Central and South Delta	Natural Resource Scientists, Inc.	G	MH				Medium	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel review. The Panel expressed concern over the appropriateness of the technique, but believes the qualitative information generated by the project would still be useful.	\$210,000
2001-L200*	City of Sacramento Intake Fish Screen Replacement Project	City of Sacramento	F		H			Medium	The Panel concurs with TARP that a budget review should be conducted and concurs with the Geographic Panel that the project is a high priority. Proposal should be referred back to AFSP for design review. Panel notes that policy issues (screening for smelt versus screening for salmon) also need resolution.	\$6,020,995
2001-L208*	Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program - Phase 2	Woodbridge Irrigation District	F			M		Medium	The Panel concurs with favorable technical reviews, and with the Geographic Panel's conclusion that this project would help meet ERP and CVPIA goals. The Panel shares the concerns of the TARP and the Geographic Panel that the project budget may be high, and that there is no cost-share.	\$680,000
TOTAL Medium								13		\$12,574,374
TOTAL High & Medium								73		\$103,821,771

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-A200	Anadromous Fish Restoration Study on the Upper San Joaquin River	USBR	F				L	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP rating of Fair and Geographic Panel 4 rating of low.	
2001-A201*	Phase 2 Stockton Channel Water Quality Restoration Study	City of Stockton	F			L		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP rating of Fair and Geographic Panel 3 rating of low.	
2001-A202	Trinity River Fishery Restoration and Protection of Delta Water Supply Through Replacement of Four Trinity River Bridges	Trinity County Planning Department	E	L/ML	ML			Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the Geographic Review Panels and Staff Review that this proposal is not a priority to fund at this time due to uncertainty about implementing an alternative flow regime on the Trinity. Applicant should consider another funding source.	
2001-A203	Investigation of Tulare Basin Environmental Water Supply	USFWS	F				ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with low TARP and Geographic Panel 4 Reviews. There may be opportunities for support with the CALFED ISI and Water Use Efficiency Programs.	
2001-A204	Using Benthic Macroinvertebrate Communities for Assessment of Adaptive Management Actions In Streams Supporting Anadromous Salmonids	USGS	G		L	M	MH	Do Not Fund	The Panel believes that this is an important topic that should be addressed. However, the Panel agrees with previous reviewers that the proposal is not appropriately focused or well-coordinated with ongoing efforts. A project of this type should be considered in the future by the CALFED Baseline Monitoring Program.	
2001-B200	Development of an Effective Management Strategy for the Introduced Chinese Mitten Crab, <i>Eriocheir sinensis</i> : Investigations of Recruitment Dynamics	UC Santa Barbara	G	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP observations that the proposal needs to strengthen hypotheses, and strengthen the relationship between this research effort and the goal of developing management strategies for control of this species.	
2001-C201*	Lower Clear Creek Floodway Restoration Project Phases 3 & 4	Western Shasta Resource Conservation District	F/G		M			Do Not Fund	The Panel shares the TARP and Geographic Panel concerns about technical feasibility. The Panel recommends reduced scope, phasing in smaller components and improved monitoring to demonstrate benefits relative to Saeltzer Dam.	

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-C202	Geomorphic Stream Restoration Demonstration Project	Sloughhouse Resource Conservation District	F			ML		Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with all the reviews and finds this proposal lacking in key areas and recommends it not be funded.	
2001-C203	Restoration of Delta Floodplain Terraces Through Bioengineering	Habitat Assessment & Restoration Team, Inc.	F	M				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the fair review of the TARP that these projects also need better biological monitoring and analysis (perhaps by cooperation with existing efforts) to fit them into an adaptive management strategy. The proponents should have submitted more information from previous bank stabilization projects in the Delta and from literature describing similar projects elsewhere.	
2001-C206	Murphy Creek Watershed Protection and Restoration Plan	American Land Conservancy	F			MH		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP rating and with Geographic Panel concerns and recommendations.	
2001-C210	San Joaquin River Research and Riparian Restoration Project	San Joaquin County Council of Governments	G	ML		M		Do Not Fund	As noted by all previous panels, the minimal details provided in this proposal hinder a thorough evaluation of the potential for, or even the need for restoration.	
2001-C211*	Merced River Ranch Restoration: Next-Phase Project	URS Woodward Clyde & DFG	G				ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with Geographic Panel comments and relatively low rating.	
2001-C212	Large-scale Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Flow and Sediment Transport in the Sacramento River Basin and Their Influence on Channel and Floodplain Morphology	Michael Singer	F/G		L			Do Not Fund	As stated by all reviewers, this proposal is attractive because it is a classic modeling situation and the information provided could eventually be very useful. However, one reviewer also thought that it might be too early in the CALFED process to begin such a project since land acquisitions and restoration are in the initial stages. There was also concern at the lack of collaborators for such an ambitious project.	
2001-C213	Understanding Natural Processes Through Active Riparian Restoration	Sacramento River Partners	G		MH			Do Not Fund	The Panel found that the proposal lacked an adequate monitoring plan assessing hydraulic, geomorphic, and aquatic species effects, as well as terrestrial species effects. In addition there were staff concerns regarding permitting.	

Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-C214	Sacramento River Floodplain Acquisition & Restoration	Sacramento River Partners	F/VG		M			Do Not Fund	Acquisition would occur in lower priority area, i.e., mostly outside the current meander belt. Scientific aspects of Monitoring Plan inadequately described.	
2001-E202*	Rhode Island Floodplain Management and Habitat Restoration	DFG	P	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with technical reviewers, TARP, Geographic Panel and Staff Review that this is a poorly written proposal.	
2001-E206	Peytona Slough Restoration	Suisun Marsh Natural History Association	F	L				Do Not Fund	Consistent with low rankings by previous panels, the Panel recommends against funding.	
2001-E207	Delta Tules: Assessment of Restoration Opportunities	Habitat Assessment & Restoration Team Inc.	P	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the poor rating by TARP and other reviewers.	
2001-E208*	Benicia Waterfront Marsh Restoration Project Phase II, Implementation	City of Benicia	G	M				Do Not Fund	As noted by the TARP and Geographic Panel 1, the cost for this project is very high relative to its ecological benefit. However, the reviewers all thought the project was well designed and especially liked the public support and education features of the project. The Panel also agreed with one reviewer that other funding such as open-space or park land funding be sought to increase the cost share.	
2001-E209	Suisun Marsh Land Acquisition and Tidal Marsh Restoration	USFWS	F	MH				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the fair rating and concerns of the TARP. Project proponents should have identified criteria for land acquisition as well as potential willing sellers.	
2001-E210*	Aquatic & Wetland Habitat Restoration for Sun River Property	Wildlands, Inc.	F	M				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the fair rating and concerns raised by the TARP.	
2001-E213	Little Mandeville Island: A Project to Demonstrate Delta Levee and Shallow Wetland Habitat Restoration and Enhancement	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	P	L				Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the recommendations of TARP which rated it poor and the Geographic Panel which rated it low.	
2001-E214*	Franks Tract/Decker Island Wetland Habitat Restoration - Next Phase	DWR	F	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the unfavorable TARP and Geographic Panel reviews.	

Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-E215*	Biological Restoration Improvements and Monitoring: Phase 2, Ponds Along Channels	CSU Hayward	P/F	L				Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with Staff that this request for next-phase funding is premature, and with the TARP that there are significant deficiencies in the proposal.	
2001-F201	Use of Microbial Indicators for Selenium Hazard Assessment and for Management of Real-time Electrical Conductivity and Dissolved Oxygen Sensor Biofouling	UC Berkeley	F				ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the relatively low ranking provided by the TARP and Geographic Panel.	
2001-F203	Tertiary & Quaternary Wastewater Treatment for Water Quality Restoration Within the Bay-Delta	UC Berkeley	F	M		L		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with Staff and TARP findings that direct CALFED and CVPIA benefits are relatively low and/or uncertain. While proposal is technically adequate, its objective of improving sewage treatment methods is of primary value to municipal dischargers, not ERP. Other concerns are that there may be legal problems having CALFED fund regulatory mandates, and the City of Stockton has not provided cost sharing.	
2001-F204	Monitoring and Assessing the Ecosystem/Water Quality in the SF/Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta Valley Region using Remote Sensing and GIS Techniques	UC Davis	F	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel that while remote sensing has great potential, the lack of detail on ground-truth methodology and on application of the methodology to contaminants greatly limits the expectation that the proposed work will provide information of direct utility for meeting CALFED objectives.	
2001-F205	The Brake Pad Partnership Project: Reducing Problem Trace Metals at Their Source	Sustainable Conservation	P	ML	L	L	L	Do Not Fund	Nearly all reviewers rated this proposal low, and the Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels.	
2001-F206	Assessing the Relative Contribution of Nutrient Sources to the San Joaquin River Using Molecular Tracers	Stroud Water Research Center	G			L	ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP that the proposal is technically sound, but the project is not recommended for funding because it is not coordinated with ongoing activities and efforts of the San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL stakeholders group and USGS research.	

October 2, 2000				2001 Proposal Information				Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-F207	Contaminant Source Control in the Watershed: An Evaluation of the In Situ Removal of Mercury From Groundwater Using Permeable Reactive Barriers	University of Waterloo	F			ML		Do Not Fund	While this proposal is technically sound, the Panel agreed that the proposed study of the transport of mercury via groundwater may not be relevant to CALFED at this time.	
2001-F208	Sediment and Hg Fate and Transport Models to Guide Monitoring and Management in the Delta	Larry Walker Associates	F	M				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP summary comments that indicate concerns about the brief project timeline and the need for integration with existing models.	
2001-F209	Evaluation of Biological Assimilatory Capacity for Mechanism-Based Adaptive Management for Selenium in the San Francisco Bay-Delta	UC Davis	F	ML		ML	M	Do Not Fund	Both the TARP and Geographic Panel 4 agreed that Objective 3 had serious deficiencies. Review comments pertaining to Objective 1 were mixed. While some portions of this project may have merit, the applicant has not structured the budget in a way that would allow the Panel to determine an appropriate level for partial funding.	
2001-F210	Bioaccumulation, Trophic Transfer & Sublethal Effects of Hydrophobic Pesticides and Heavy Metals in Invertebrates & Fish in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	UC Davis	G	ML				Do Not Fund	Funding is not recommended as the TARP and Geographic Panel identified several substantial technical concerns which suggest the work would not be successful in meeting objectives.	
2001-F211	Spring Creek Arm of Keswick Reservoir Metal Sludge Feasibility Study & Design	USEPA	P		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP rating of poor and Geographic Panel of low. There is not a demonstrated link to a PSP priority area. Did not demonstrate a clear threat to upper Sacramento River or Bay-Delta water quality. CERCLA liability issues were also of concern.	
2001-F213*	San Joaquin River Dissolved Oxygen Depletion Next Phase Funding Request for 2001	DWR	G	M		MH	ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels. Project confusing, linkages between tasks unclear, feasibility in question. All agreed DO problem is an important issue but serious concerns about this proposal as is preclude a recommendation for funding.	

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-F214	Distribution Patterns of Mercury and Methylmercury in Tidal Wetland Ecosystems of North San Francisco Bay	San Francisco Estuary Institute	F	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the TARP, Staff and Geographic Panel 1 that, although mercury research is needed, there are significant questions about the proposed methodology and the ability of the applicants to complete the research.	
2001-F217*	Irrigation Drainage Water Treatment for Selenium Removal: Panoche Drainage District Implementation	Panche Drainage District	G				ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels. The Panel concurs with the TARP that implementation is premature and should be preceded by additional evaluation of processes.	
2001-G200*	Canal Ranch Habitat Restoration Phase III Demonstration Project	DFG	F	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with Staff Review recommendation that applicant resubmit for FY2002 funds since Phase II contract was just signed in July 2000 and therefore not ready for Phase III funding.	
2001-G201	Wildlife-Friendly Farming Demonstration	BLM	G	M		ML		Do Not Fund	The Panel considers the proposal premature; suggests proposal be resubmitted once land is acquired.	
2001-G204	Conservation Easements for Agricultural Lands/CEAL Project	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	G			MH		Do Not Fund	The Panel recommends not funding given that TARP questioned the need to purchase an easement on the Amaral property, and 90% of the funds would be applied towards unidentified parcels which could not be evaluated for ecological value or development pressures.	
2001-G205	Rice in the Delta: A Pilot Project to Convert 10,000 Acres of Legal Delta Lands to Rice Production and Study the Effects of Rice Culture on Wildlife Benefits, Subsidence and Water Quality.	Ducks Unlimited, Inc.	VG	ML				Do Not Fund	Timing and scale of project considered inappropriate given the uncertainty of adoption by local growers.	
2001-H201	Upper Trinity River Watershed Stewardship Project	Trinity County Resource Conservation District	G		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel comments that there is no demonstrated benefit to the Central Valley Watershed.	
2001-H204	Sierra Forest Communities Institute	Sierra Forest Communities Institute (SFCI)	P			L		Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the recommendations of the TARP which rated it poor, and the Geographic Panel which rated it low.	

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-H206*	Management Plan Implementation for Ecological Preserves of Butte County	CSU Chico	P		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP who gave this proposal a poor rating and Geographic Panel 2 who gave the proposal a low rating because the project was too poorly defined to fund at this time.	
2001-H210*	Science-Based Adaptive Management of the Lower American River	City of Sacramento, Water Forum	F			ML		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with Geographic Panel 3 and TARP that while project is potentially valuable, project is too poorly defined to be considered for funding at this time. Proponents are encouraged to build upon successful completion of first phase and continue projects in the future.	
2001-I200	Working at a Watershed Level	DWR	F				MH	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP evaluation that the need for funding was not clearly demonstrated. Certain costs, vaguely described, added up to \$17,000.	
2001-I203	Partnerships for Environmental Education	DFG	F				M	Do Not Fund	Applicants did not demonstrate that they worked with or were supported by the local school districts/educators. The substance of the curriculum was not described.	
2001-I206*	Master River Teacher Program	San Joaquin River Parkway & Conservation Trust, Inc.	P	M		L	ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the TARP which ranked it poor and was concerned with the lack of clearly developed curriculum. It is noteworthy that it was ranked medium low by Geographic Panel 4.	
2001-I212*	Next-Phase Funding for Expanding California Salmon Habitat Through Nonregulatory Mechanisms to Alter Dams & Diversions	Institute for Fisheries Resources	P		L	H	L	Do Not Fund	This is a request for funds to advocate and lobby a policy position, which may or may not be consistent with CALFED. Staff, Technical Panel, and two of three Geographic Panels all concluded this is not appropriate for CALFED funding.	
2001-J202	Propagation/Establishment Techniques & Habitat Requirements for Special Status Plant Species	Bitterroot Restoration, Inc.	P	L				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel summary comments and low ratings.	
2001-J203*	Ecosystem Restoration - The Relationship Between Water Temperature and Steelhead Trout Growth and Productivity in the Corte Madera Creek Watershed	Friends of Corte Madera Creek Watershed	F	ML				Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the criticisms of the TARP and medium low priority assigned by the Geographic Panel.	

October 2, 2000		2001 Proposal Information						Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-K200	Mill Creek Anadromous Fish Adaptive Management Enhancement Plan	Orange Cove Irrigation District	P		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP poor and Geographic Panel low ratings.	
2001-K201	Genetic Population Structure of Central Valley Chinook Salmon	DFG	VG	MH	MH	M	M	Do Not Fund	The proposal did not consider the results of prior DNA work that has been funded by IEP, CVPIA, CALFED and MWD (as part of Category III). The otolith component is premature pending the analysis of prior studies funded by the CVPIA and IEP.	
2001-K202	Use of the Delta for Rearing by Central Valley Chinook Salmon	DFG	G	M	M	M	M/MH	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels that this is important work but the proposal lacks focus. The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panels' lack of confidence in technical feasibility of the project.	
2001-K205	The Influence of Discharge, Temperature, and Fine Sediment on the Hyporheic Zone: Intragravel Conditions and Anadromous Salmonid Egg Survival	USBR	P		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with the TARP who gave the proposal a poor rating and with Geographic Panel 2 who considered this proposal to have low relevance to their region.	
2001-K207	Lower Yuba River Monitoring and Research Program	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	G			M		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with concerns expressed by TARP and Geographic Panel. The proposal lacks a rigorous experimental design and sufficient details.	
2001-K208	Evaluation of Central Valley Floodplain Fish Rearing Habitat and Potential Losses from Stranding	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	F			L		Do Not Fund	As per TARP, the Panel concurs that project unlikely to provide accurate assessment of the value of floodplain habitat or the effects of stranding. Feasibility questions raised by Geographic Panel, as well as concerns about ESA, costs, staffing and overlap with other ongoing activities.	
2001-K211	Health & Physiological Effects of Elevated Water Temperatures on Juvenile Chinook	USFWS	P				L	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the low rankings of the TARP and Geographic Panel.	
2001-K216	Cosumnes River Comparative Research Rearing Project	The Fishery Foundation of California	F			ML		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel's recommendations and relatively low rating.	
2001-K220	Reintroduction of Native Salmonids into Central Valley Headwaters: Bioengineering and Social Acceptability	The Planning and Conservation League Foundation	VG		L	MH	ML	Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the recurring theme throughout all previous reviews that this proposal may generate significant opposition and ultimately be counterproductive, and has determined that it is premature to fund this proposal.	

October 2, 2000				2001 Proposal Information				Initial Recommendations		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
				1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
2001-L201*	Sacramento River Fish Small Screen Project Vertical River Pump Diversions	Natural Resources Conservation Service	VG		MH			Do not Fund	The Panel reluctantly decided not to fund as request is for a 5 year project and CALFED can not approve projects beyond 3 years. Proponent specified within the proposal that tasks were not separable and that partial or incremental funding for this project is neither feasible or desired.	
2001-L202	Suisun Marsh Fish Screening Program	DFG	P	M				Do not Fund	The Panel concurs with TARP and Geographic Panel recommendations.	
2001-L211	Sutter Mutual Water Company Positive Barrier Fish Screen Project	Sutter Mutual Water Company	P		H			Do Not Fund	The Panel agrees with all the reviews that this proposal is deficient in many areas and that it had no stated objective or hypothesis, and no conceptual model. The TARP rated it poor based on CALFED criteria, but that the project had excellent merit. The Geographic Panel ranked it high and suggested that it be funded in phases. The Selection Panel agrees but recommends no funding as Phase I is not complete.	
2001-L214	Mokelumne River Water Diversion Screening Feasibility Study	North San Joaquin Water Conservation District	P			M		Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the concerns expressed by the Scientific and Technical reviewers and the Geographic Panel. The TARP rated the proposal as poor. The Panel concurs with the TARP review that several inappropriate tasks were proposed. When coupled with concerns about the intent and capabilities of the project team, funding is not warranted at this time.	
2001-L215*	Fish Screen and Intake Improvements to Coleman National Fish Hatchery on Battle Creek	USBR	F		L			Do Not Fund	The Panel concurs with the TARP and Geographic Panels' comments.	
2001-L217	Meridian Farms Water Company Fish Screen Project	USFWS	none		MH			Do Not Fund	Although the Geographic Panel considered this a high priority screening location, the proposal does not fit into the PSP format and details are not adequate to judge technical merit. The project, and the feasibility report on consolidation of diversions should be forwarded to AFSP staff for further consideration.	
TOTAL Do Not Fund								66		

				Geographic Panel Reviews				Selection Panel Recommendation		
Proposal No.	Project Title	Applicant/ Organization	Topic Area Review Panel	1-Bay Delta	2-Sac R.	3-Feath/Sut/ Yolo/EST	4-SJR	Priority Ranking	Justification	Amount Recommended
KEY:										
Proposal Numbers with * are Next-phase proposals										
Topic Area Review Panel: E = Excellent, VG = Very Good, G = Good, F = Fair and P = Poor										
Geographic Panel Reivews: H = High, MH = Medium High, M = Medium, ML = Medium Low and L = Low										